REMARKS

The examiner has rejected claims 10-18 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Claims 10-18 have been replaced with new claims 19-28 and it is believed that the new claims are not open to rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The examiner has rejected claims 10-18 over the prior art, relying on Tiedemann and Ledbetter as the principal combination of references.

The subject matter of this application, as defined in claim 19, is a vibration damper that comprises a body part (corresponding to the body part 10 in the case of the illustrated embodiment), and a guide shaft (corresponding to the shaft 13) disposed in the interior space (19) of the body part. An oscillating piece (20) that comprises a plurality of parts removably fastened to each is disposed in the interior space of the body part, whereby the oscillating piece divides the interior space of the body part into two regions, at opposite sides respectively of the oscillating piece. The oscillating piece is movable relative to the body part, movement of the oscillating piece being guided by the guide shaft. At least one spring (29) fastens the oscillating piece to the body part. The guide shaft comprises a wall defining an interior space of the guide shaft, and the wall of the guide shaft is formed with openings (16, 17) for forming a flow connection between the interior space of the guide shaft and the two regions of the interior space of the body part.

Tiedemann discloses a vibration damper, the operation of which is more or less based on the absorption of the vibration energy. The damping effect is accomplished by a piston 16, the movement of which is restricted by compressible fluid inside the damper casing. The damper comprises a hollow shaft 14 having ports 20 on both sides of the piston, near the ends of the casing. As the piston moves near the casing end, it covers the port, and consequently the fluid pressure between the piston and the casing end rises, which in turn dampens the movement of the

piston. Piston movement and thus the frequency to be damped can be adjusted by varying the distance between the ports or by changing the gas pressure. Thus, the damping effect of the damper is completely based on the damping effect created by compressible fluid inside the casing. Further, the damper of Tiedemann is capable of operating over a wide frequency range without adjustment.

Ledbetter discloses a so-called reactive force or Frahm damper, which generates vibration of equal frequency but opposite phase with respect to the frequency to be damped. For this reason this kind of a damper must be exactly tuned to the resonant frequency, otherwise it may create a second resonant frequency to the system. Therefore, the damper is provided with springs and an adjustable mass by means of which the frequency to be damped can be adjusted accurately.

The operating principles of the dampers shown respectively by Tiedemann and Ledbetter are incompatible. Because the damper shown by Tiedemann operates over a wide frequency range without adjustment, the skilled person has no motivation to modify the oscillating piece or its fastening structure based on the disclosure in Ledbetter. Applicant therefore submits that the disclosures of Tiedemann and Ledbetter cannot properly be combined in the manner suggested by the examiner.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 19 is not disclosed or suggested by Tiedemann and Ledbetter, whether taken singly or in combination. Therefore,

claim 19 is patentable and it follows that the dependent claims also are patentable.

Respectfully submitted,

John Smith-Hill
Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100
Fax (503) 574-3197

Docket: AWEK 3458